



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,133	06/01/2001	Tim Clark	VTTI-P2702	1924

21259 7590 08/14/2006

J. MARK HOLLAND AND ASSOCIATES
3 SAN JOAQUIN PLAZA
SUITE 210
NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660

EXAMINER

HARTMAN JR, RONALD D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2121

DATE MAILED: 08/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/872,133	Applicant(s) CLARK ET AL.	
	Examiner Ronald D. Hartman Jr.	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 June 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 19-21, 30-33 and 39-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 19-21, 30-33 and 39-46 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 19-21, 30-33 and 39-46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wendell, U.S. Patent No. 5,616,239, in view of Hunter, U.S. Patent No. 6,363,422.

As per claims 19, 30, 39-40 and 45, Wendell teaches a remote monitoring and control system for a water installation, the system comprising:

- a plurality of sensors for monitoring a plurality of water installation parameters (e.g. C3 L15-40);
- an electronic data acquisition and control device, in electrical communication with the sensors, for receiving data signals indicative of the monitored water parameters, and for selectively generating control signals to control devices related to the water parameters (e.g. "CPU"; Figure 1 element 112 and C4 L24-36); and
- a remote computer (e.g. "remote CPU"; Figure 1 element 194 and C6 L26-38).

As per claims 19 and 40, Wendell does not specifically teach the use of a network interface for providing a web based network connection between a remote computer/server and the data acquisition and control device.

Hunter teaches the use of a network interface for providing a web based network connection between a remote server and a data acquisition and control device, wherein the interface includes a means for transmitting data to the remote server and a means

for transmitting control data to the related devices, wherein the control data is transmitted from the remote server. (e.g. C13 L10-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Hunter into Wendell for the purpose of providing an web based means for monitoring and controlling remote device(s) and allowing an operator bi-directional communications, including both monitoring and controlling functions, by utilizing a graphically implemented user interface to aid in visualizing the remote operational conditions and status of the remote controlled device(s), regardless of the geographic location of an operator and/or the remote controlled device(s).

Furthermore, as per the amendments to claims 19, 39-40 and 45, presented in the response filed on 6/5/2006, it is noted that Wendell's combined system also discloses a feature wherein an error condition may be detected and in response to the detection of an error condition being detected, an error alert may be generated (e.g. See Wendell, C4 L11-23 and also see Hunter, C15 L35-57 and C16 L28-45).

Furthermore, as per the amendments to claim 19 and as per claim 30, presented in the response filed on 6/5/2006, it is noted that "periodically transmitting data to the remote server at a selectable interval" is a feature that is adequately anticipated by Wendell's combined system (e.g. See Hunter, C6 L33-42, C13 L10-17 and C13 L53 – C14 L7).

As per claims 30 and 39, Wendell teaches control of a pool or spa (Abstract).

As per claims 21, 30-33, 39 and 45, Wendell does not specifically teach controlling using the Internet, storing data in a remote server, accessing the remote server using the Internet and viewing current operational data stored on the remote server, wherein the stored data on the remote server is in the form of a graph, table or chart.

Hunter teaches controlling multiple aspects of a building automation system using the Internet, storing data in a remote server, accessing the remote server using the Internet and viewing current operational data using a remote server, wherein the stored data is in the form of a graph, table of chart (e.g. C3 L2-17 and C13 L30-39).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Hunter into Wendell so as to provide a way of minimizing the computations of the local computer system. That is, by allowing for monitoring functions to take place remotely, the local computer system is able to run more effectively since it does not need to concern itself with the monitoring functions, and less storage space is needed on the local computer system for efficiently running the system. Furthermore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have incorporated the teachings of Hunter into Wendell for the purpose of providing a means by which the parameters, related to the water installation, may be graphically visualized so that an operator may efficiently operate the water installation utilizing graphical representations, of water installation parameters, displayed on a display screen.

As per claim 20, Wendell teaches remotely viewing a current operational state of the water installation (e.g. C4 L43-49).

As per claims 41 and 46, Wendell's combined system (Wendell in view of Hunter) teaches the use of a web browser for viewing data (e.g. See Hunter; Claim 6).

As per claims 42 and 46, Wendell's combined system teaches the use of JAVA (e.g. See Hunter; C13 L18-39), and the use of JAVA applets is inherent to the capabilities and known functions related to the use of JAVA.

As per claims 43-44, Wendell teaches controlling a pool and spa (e.g. C2 L57-60).

Furthermore, as per pending claim 45, it is noted that if the remote server is located a large distance from the sensors, as typically is the case for remote monitoring and control systems, the sensors communicating with the server only via the Internet is a feature which would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art since this is precisely the point of allowing monitoring and controlling devices over the Internet, that is, to allow the monitoring and control to occur over great distances where a wire based connection would not be feasible. Therefore, to incorporate a feature wherein the communication occurs only via the Internet appears to be a functional capability of Wendell's combined system, and therefore is believed to adequately anticipate this feature.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 6/5/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive for the following reason(s):

The applicant has argued that the prior art does not teach features (1), (2) and (3), on page 3 of the applicant's remarks. It is believed that the rejections set forth above adequately rebut the applicants assertions, and therefore since the claims have not been amended in a manner which overcomes the prior art of record, and since the examiner has maintained his rejection which relied on the combined system of Wendell (Wendell in view of Hunter), this action is being made FINAL.

Conclusion

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald D. Hartman Jr. whose telephone number is (571) 272-3684. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Fri., 11:00 - 8:30 pm, EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Knight can be reached on (571) 272-3687. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Ronald D Hartman Jr.
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2121

RDH
August 9, 2006

Ramesh Patel
RAMESH PATEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER
For Anthony Knight
8/10/06